BEFORE THE UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS HUNTINGTON DIVISION In the Matter of: Public Meeting In Re: The General Jenkins House ************* Transcript of proceedings had at a hearing held in the aforementioned matter on Thursday, the 10th day of May, 2001, beginning at 7:12 p.m., at the Huntington High School, Huntington, Cabell County, West Virginia. ACCURATE REPORTING SERVICE, INC. 526 SEVENTH STREET HUNTINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA (304) 345-9891 * (304) 522-9637 * (606) 329-2154

1	APPEARANCES:	On Behalf of the Corps of Engineers:
2		Mr. Wayne Budrus
3		Maj. Ken Koebberling
4		Steve Wright
		Bob Maslowski
5		
6		Todd Mitchell
7		Doretta McComas
8		Carol Turley
9		Wally Dean
10		Ben Borda
11		Adam Scarberry
12		Randy Campbell
13		Ginger Mullins
14		Lea Bodmer
15		
16		
17		
18		•
19		
20	·	
21		
22		
23		
24		

MR. BUDRUS: Okay. I'd like to 1 thank you all for coming tonight. My name is 2 Wayne Budrus. I'm from the Army Corps of 3 Engineers, project manager for the Robert C. Byrd 4 Project. And the General Jenkins House in Green 5 Bottom is part of that project. 6 All right. What we'd like to do tonight is 7 -- I think you all know that we've been authorized 8 with the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 9 to preserve and restore the Jenkins House. 10 we'd like to do is gather input as far as 11 12 comments, ideas, recommendations that we can use in developing that strategy to restore the house. 13 Before I get started, we have several people 14 15 here tonight. We have Greg Parsons from Congressman Rahall's office. Greg. 16 From the West Virginia Division of Culture 17 and History, we have Nancy Herholdt, the 18 Commissioner. 19 And, Nancy, if you'd like to introduce your 20 staff? 21 22 MS. NANCY HERHOLDT: Okay. Like I

say, I'm Nancy Herholdt from the Division --

Commissioner of the Division of Culture and

23

History. This is the assisstant director of programming, Stan Bumgardner, who is also the liaison for our historic sites; and from our Historic Preservation Unit, our senior archeologist, Joanna Wilson; and deputy state historic preservation officer and director of our H&P Unit, Susan Pierce; and from our archives and history staff, Joe Banks.

MR. BUDRUS: And if you have any comments you'd like to make before we get started?

was appointed in February. But my first Saturday
-- this will be very brief. The first Saturday
after I was appointed in February, my family and I
visited the Jenkins House. We got a fantastic
tour from Greg, and I'm sure it wasn't unusual.
But he was gracious enough to let me walk in on
him.

And I just want to tell you all, though some of you have been involved with the Jenkins Project for many areas, I am so excited about the possibilities there, and I'm happy to be here at this point in time where we're going to start moving in a direction to get into a major

restoration, and that will allow the Culture of
History to have many opportunities historic
interpretation of all the different stories that
relate to the Jenkins Plantation.

And then I also am really happy to see all of you here because we also want it to be a community center for the community, a source of pride and a place where you can be involved and work with us. Coming here tonight and hearing what you have to say is very important because it will help us make good decisions and make good plans in the very near future as we start on this process.

So thank you very much.

MR. BUDRUS: Thank you, Nancy.

From the West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, we have Tom Dotson and Kem Shaw right here.

From the Corps of Engineers, we have Major

Ken Koebberling, the Deputy District Engineer; and
then Steve Wright from our Public Affairs Office;

Bob Maslowski, our archeologist; Ben Borda and
Ginger Mullins from the Planning Division; Wally
Dean from Planning; Lea Bodmer from Real Estate;
and I think there's a couple of others here that I

forgot, possibly -- Randy Campbell and Todd Mitchell.

2.1

I guess one administrative announcement. If anyone needs to find the washroom, the nearest ones are just outside and across the hall.

They're pretty easy to get to. If you just go outside and take a right, they're right across the hall.

Okay. What I'll do now is get into an overview of the history -- it's not the history from the 1800s but the history of the Corps' involvement with the house - before we request input as far as recommendations and ideas on what we should do as far as the restoration goes.

Okay. As I said before, this is part of the Robert C. Byrd Project, formerly the Gallipolis Project, part of the mitigation for the impacts we did when we constructed the new locks at Robert C. Byrd.

This is the oldest known photo that I'm aware of, a 1906 photo of the house. You can see some outbuildings adjacent to the house, some barns here. The Ohio River is back here and Ohio is over here.

This is a photo taken after the rehabilitation in 1992. This gives you a newer shot of the house.

You probably are all more familiar with the house than I am.

Okay. From the beginning of the Byrd

Project, or Gallipolis at the time, in the
environmental impact statement done in '81, it
included the Green Bottom site. And the Green

Bottom site was part of the mitigation for
construction impacts due to the locks'
construction.

A memorandum of agreement was signed in 1986

-- and can everybody one hear me back there just
to make sure? Okay -- with the National Advisory
Council, the state historic preservation officer
and the Corps of Engineers. They basically
stipulated all the archeological survey
requirements for any work done at the site,
required an historic preservation management plan,
required the Corps to rehabilitate the house, and
the West Virginia DNR at that time would take over
the house and use it as an office once the
rehabilitation was completed.

In March of '88, we did a master plan for the Gallipolis Project. It included the rehabilitation of the house, also that the house would be used as an office for the DNR.

In 1988, the property was purchased as part of the Green Bottom Wildlife Management Area, and at that time we had a lot of public involvement, hunting issues, nonhunting issues, historic issues, environmental issues, and that led to the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 which added language which prevented the transfer of the property to the state of West Virginia.

All the plans up to this point had us buying the property, creating a mitigation site, rehabilitating the house and then turning it over in fee or turning it over by deed to the state of West Virginia.

From this point on, though, that's changed and now it's leased to the West Virginia DNR, and the house and surrounding acreage is subleased to the West Virginia Division of Culture and History.

Okay. Prior to that sublease, we did a memorandum of understanding between the agencies involved, the West Virginia DNR, the Division of

ACCURATE REPORTING SERVICE, INC.

Culture and History and the Army Corps of
Engineers. Everyone involved agreed that the
Jenkins House should be made available for public
interpretation. We all agreed that this should
best be accomplished by the Division of Culture
and History because that's where their expertise
is.

At that time, it was agreed that the site would include the house and approximately four acres surrounding it.

There's an additional buffer area which would be managed by the DNR but could be used by Culture and History on a coordinated basis.

We once again reaffirmed we would rehabilitate the house and, subject to available funding, Culture and History would explore the ideas of subleasing and then explore the restoration of the property. Once again, that was subject to available funding.

In 1989, the area was leased to the West
Virginia DNR, Division of Natural Resources, for
them to administer and maintain. Part of the
lease was to preserve the Jenkins House and fully
coordinate any restoration or rehabilitation

efforts that they would undergo.

Okay. In 1990, Culture and History had a contractor prepare a design for the rehabilitation, which was funded by the Corps. That followed on in 1991 with a contract to rehabilitate the house. It was an \$88,000 contract to Cravens Construction. Work was finished in '92.

Upon completion of the rehabilitation, the house was occupied by the West Virginia DNR as an office and a home for -- a residence for the person who managed the site.

Between 1992 and 1994, the Corps of Engineers completed its mitigation efforts at the Green Bottom site. What that included was the construction of this new wetland area, the dark blue area. We created roughly 75 to 80 acres of new wetlands as part of the mitigation for the project at Byrd. We constructed dikes on both ends of the wetlands and a water supply system from the Ohio River to feed that during dry periods and then some nesting islands to enhance it for wildlife management.

We also constructed a road on the upstream

end of the project and a boat ramp which was originally used by the DNR but since has been opened to the public.

The existing wetlands, the light blue area here, all we did was construct a preservation weir at the downstream end of the wetlands, at the outlet. I think the elevation of the weir was 544. And why that was done was to maintain a minimal level of wetlands in case anything should ever happen. There's a lot of beaver dams in the area. We were going to maintain it at a minimum level of 544.

A VOICE: Where is the house in that picture?

MR. BUDRUS: The house is right here in this white area -- or yellow area, yes.

Okay. In 1993, a development plan was prepared for the Cabell County Historical Landmarks Commission by Professor Baroni from Fairmont State, and it gives us an idea or an inspection of the rehab work that we had done. It basically said that everything was in fairly good condition, finishes, doors and windows, roof, some groundwater leakage in the basement, and

recommended a perimeter drain. The exterior of the house was in good order, but they did note that in the past, there had been some flooding on both the first floor and the basement.

Okay. Based on some requests from the public, we did evaluate potential impacts of the adjacent wetlands on the house in 1992 and later in 1995. The inspection in 1992 showed the basement dry, some mold and mildew present, but no structural distress was noted at that time.

Once again, it was evaluated in 1995, found some water in the floor drains, once again some mold and mildew present. The West Virginia DNR did note that during heavy rains, you did have water coming in through the foundation through cracks in the walls. A lot of surface water during heavy rains would come in against the foundation and come through.

There were no signs of structural distress at the time, but it did note that some of the ground did slope towards the house.

Conclusions: The major problem as far as water infiltration appears to be surface run-off.

The floor drain system wasn't functioning

completely at the time, but no evidence that the existing wetland was affecting the basement. And I've got a slide later to depict that graphically for you.

Recommendations: Clean out and repair the drain system, repair it, and install a foundation drain as a last resort, some sloping of the area to take the run-off away from the house. Some of the downspouts were dropping water against the house -- some work to get that water away from the house when it rains.

This gives you an idea of where the wetlands are in relation to the basement of the house, the level of the wetlands and the level of the basement floor.

We surveyed this first in June of '92, and at that time there was a 6-foot difference between the wetlands and the basement floor. In January of '95, it was a 6.2-foot difference. In April of 2001 -- we had someone out there about a month ago -- a 5.3-foot difference between the level of the wetlands and the basement floor.

But you have to note that this data is affected by seasonal rainfall effects and beaver

dam activity behind the house, which is going to have some effect on that.

If you come out there in a dry period, say a drought like last summer or the summer before, it may have been even lower than this. So, that's going to be affected by those three items.

Okay. In March of '96 the house was subleased by the West Virginia DNR to the Division of Culture and History. The sublease requires the provision of O&M funding, a resident to occupy the house, an annual meeting to coordinate upcoming events, especially critical in coordinating with opening seasons for different hunting seasons when you're going to have a lot of hunters out there -- that may be a time when you don't want to have a big historical effort going on at the same time -- and also the provision of a yearly management plan.

Okay. The latest language was WRDA 2000,
Water Resources Development Act of 2000 -- and I
copied the language out of the act. It says that
the secretary shall ensure the preservation and
restoration of the structure known as the Jenkins
House in accordance with the standards for sites

listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Up until this point, our authorization has only been to preserve and rehabilitate. This takes us to another level which we didn't have the authority to do before. And that's one of the reasons we're here tonight, to gather input on what people think that should be and how this is going to cause some interactions between the environmental side and the historical side.

If we can get all the input, we can develop a strategy that everyone can live with and hopefully everyone thinks is a good strategy. We don't want to develop something in a void and have a lot of problems we had when Green Bottom first started or when the Corps tried to do its construction at Green Bottom.

There is one significant issue as far as the flood plain goes. The hundred-year flood elevation at the site is 560.8 feet. The first floor is at 559.4, which is roughly a 72-year frequency -- pretty close to the hundred year but just below it.

The ground elevation at the house is at

554.3, which is a 20-year frequency. Okay.

That's the elevation of the ground right adjacent to the house. That quickly drops off to 550 on three sides of the house, basically within a hundred feet of the house, because the house is built on a knoll.

Okay. To give you an idea of what that means, as far as potential flooding does, we put together some probabilities of flooding. This is just to give you an idea. The probability of the first floor being flooded in any one year is 1.39 percent. Then as you go down, the probability of it happening once in the next 10, 20 and 30 years raises up to a pretty significant percentage, and that's something that we have to consider as we develop the plan.

Go ahead.

MR. NED JONES: Is the first floor the basement?

MR. BUDRUS: The first floor is the one you walk up four or five steps to. That's considered the first. All right. It's elevated, what, four or five feet above the ground.

MR. BOB MASLOWSKI: Yeah.

So, these are 1 MR. BUDRUS: Yes. some of the issues that we're going to have to 2 work through as we develop the strategy. 3 I quess now if anybody has any questions over what I've gone over, I'd be happy to try to answer 5 those. But if you would, if I could get your 6 7 names so that we could record that, though. 8 MR. PETE SAMOSKY: My name is Pete Samosky, and I have a question. In 1995, you said 9 that the DNR took over the lease and they were 10 going to have a full-time resident there. 11 12 that happen? Did that happen? Because I've been there over 50 times and never seen anybody there. 13 MR. BUDRUS: Okay. When the DNR 14 took over the property in 1988, the resident 15 16 manager did live there. Culture and History took over the property in I think '96. 17 MR. NED JONES: 'Is there somebody 18 there now staffing the place? 19 MR. BUDRUS: Based on the funding 20 that they have available, they have someone there 21 three days a week I think is how it works right 22 23 now.

24

MR. MASLOWSKI: Originally they had

1	someone living there.
2	MR. BUDRUS: Okay. Originally they
3	had someone living there.
4	MR. PETE SAMOSKY: Who is there
5	now?
6	MR. GREG MILLER: I'm there every
7	day.
8	MR. PETE SAMOSKY: You're there
9	every day?
10	MR. GREG MILLER: Yes, sir, every
11	day.
12	MR. PETE SAMOSKY: Seven days a
13	week?
14	MR. GREG MILLER: Seven days a
15	week. I'm not there 24 hours a day, but I'm there
16	at least one hour a day. It is not the same hour
17	every day, but there are three days out of the
18	week where I'm there the same hours.
19	MR. PETE SAMOSKY: What hours are
20	those?
21	MR. GREG MILLER: I'm usually there
22	from eight o'clock in the morning till about six
23	o'clock in the evening, and I'm there Wednesdays,
24	Thursdays and Saturdays.

```
1
                    MR. BUDRUS: Yes, he has been there
2
     because we've made visits.
                                   I've never seen you
3
                    MR. SAMOSKY:
4
     there.
                    MR. STEVE WRIGHT: Folks, we're
5
     qetting lost here on names. And if we just -- if
 6
 7
     you can, identify yourself.
 8
                    MR. GREG MILLER:
                                       I'm Greg Miller.
                    MR. WRIGHT: He's the manager at
 9
     the site.
10
                    MR., BUDRUS: Any other questions?
11
12
                    MS. KAREN NANCE: Have you any idea
     -- Karen Nance. Do you know where the level of
13
     the foundation is? You have the basement floor
14
15
     there, but of course that's not the foundation to
     the house. Do you know how deep that foundation
16
17
     is?
                     MR. BUDRUS: The thickness of the
18
     foundation?
19
                     MS. KAREN NANCE:
                                       How deep it goes.
20
                     MR. BUDRUS: That I don't have, the
21
22
     thickness.
23
                     MR. TODD MITCHELL: Yeah, we've got
      it. We did an elevation on it.
24
```

MR. BUDRUS: You've got the level 1 2 of the basement floor, but the foundation below it, we don't have that -- the footers below it. 3 No, we haven't excavated that. 4 MS. KAREN NANCE: You don't have 5 6 the footings, the stone footings? 7 MR. BUDRUS: What we have is when you walk into the basement, the level of the 8 To get down to the footers below that, 9 that has never been excavated, has it Bob? 10 MR. MASLOWSKI: No, it has never 11 12 been excavated. 13 MR. BUDRUS: Okay. I quess what we'd like to do now is -- and if you have any 14 other questions that come to your mind, go ahead 15 and ask them. What I'm looking for now is any 16 input, recommendations, ideas or concerns that we 17 should utilize in developing the strategy to 18 restore the house, just whatever you have. 19 20 We'd like to use in -- to get as much information as we can so that when we develop the 21 strategy, we make it fully coordinated. And as we 22 develop it, there will be periodic reviews and 23

continued public communication so that there are

no surprises when we're done.

Basically what I'm looking

Basically what I'm looking for is any ideas you guys have that would be used in developing that strategy.

MS. KAREN NANCE: I signed up. I thought you were going to go down the list of people who signed up, but you're not. It doesn't matter?

MR. BUDRUS: We can.

MS. KAREN NANCE: Well, it doesn't

11 | matter.

MR. BUDRUS: Why don't you just

13 start.

MS. KAREN NANCE: Okay. I'm Karen Nance, and I have a few points that I wanted to make.

We now have an opportunity to make history come alive in Green Bottom Plantation, the stories of all the people, peoples white and African-American, can be told if we develop a plan that takes into account all the history of the site. We will have not only a first class heritage education facility, but we will also have a tourist destination attraction unlike any other

in the region.

In order to accomplish this, we need to dry up the pond of water located directly in front of the historic Jenkins House because this pool of water is damaging -- endangering the structural integrity of the house.

In addition we need the develop a visitor intake center where visitors can be greeted, operations can be ran, handicap accessibility mitigated, heritage programs that cannot be performed on original plantation sites presented and a museum dedicated to the African-American heritage can mitigate the loss of the African-American site at Green Bottom.

The restoration work needs to be of the best quality and dependent on archeological and historical research. The native American artefacts excavated at Green Bottom need to be brought back to Green Bottom and displayed and interpreted in the visitor center.

In conclusion, such a site would enable Green
Bottom to be all inclusive with wetlands for
environmentalists to study and bird-watchers to
enjoy the wildlife, a wildlife management area for

hunters and a major historic site for heritage 1 education and tourism. 2 The Department of Natural Resources and 3 4 Culture and History could organize joint nature and heritage programs. This is what I have always 5 6 supported and continue to support at Green Bottom. 7 MR. BUDRUS: Thank you, Karen. I get a copy of that, too, just in case we miss 8 9 something? 10 MS. KAREN NANCE: Yes. I get 11 tongue-tied, so it's better if I do it. 12 MR. BUDRUS: That's okay. That's 13 okay. Okay. Peter Samosky. 14 MR. SAMOSKY: She's got her hand 15 16 up. 17 MR. BUDRUS: Oh, okay. Go ahead. 18 MS. BEVERLY WHITE: Beverly White. My question is how large is the pond which she 19 20 refers to being drained? How large an area has to be drained? 21 22 MS. KAREN NANCE: A couple hundred 23 feet or a little better wide and just the width of 24 where the driveway used to go down and over to

where the Turkey Creek --1 MS. BEVERLY WHITE: There's a river 2 flowing around about 20 acres. 3 MS. KAREN NANCE: No, no, not of 4 wetlands. You know, there's dry land below the 5 We'd like to put some of the buildings 6 back on it. But the land is already dry. 7 MS. BEVERLY WHITE: Okay. 8 MR. BUDRUS: I think if -- the 9 numbers that you had shown me before, I think if I 10 multiply it out, it's somewhere around a half 11 That's just off the back of my memory. The 12 acre. 20 acres I think was your entire area. 13 wouldn't be 20 acres drained. That would be 20 14 15 acres total. So, that's -- you know, we'd have to look at 16 that. But what they were looking at was -- I 17 think what you really mean was to extend the lawn 18 19 area on the river side of the house. MS. KAREN NANCE: It's about -- the 20 water is about 100 feet or 107 feet or so in front 21 of the house now, and the original plan called for 22 it -- I tried with my ruler to tell on the map --23

about 300 feet in front of the house.

So, you know, we'd be going back about 1 another couple hundred feet back to where it was 2 originally, which was just like a little wetland 3 stream I think originally in the front, and just 4 in front of the house, between where the road came 5 What was originally flooded by the beavers is 6 7 all that we're concerned about. MR. BUDRUS: And that's their 8 9 proposal. Well, ma'am, that will be considered, yes. 10 MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: Wendell 11 Argabrite, A-r-g-a-b-r-i-t-e. What's the purpose 12 of draining this? 13 MS. KAREN NANCE: Well, I know that 14 the Corps didn't seem to think it bothered the 15 house, but I've been in house construction for a 16 long time, and that foundation is lower than what 17 the basement floor is. And I feel like that water 18 being so close to the house is really -- there's 19 mold on the front brick and there's a lot of 20 moisture there and the trees are bothering me --21 22 they're dying -- that were on the front lawn. 23 I like trees. And there's mushrooms up in them.

So, I think the idea was so that, you know,

the tree roots could dry out, the ones in front of 1 the house, and then the house itself would be able 2 to drain better. See, now all that rainwater comes off the house and it goes down the yard and hits the pond of water, and it used to have a 5 larger dip in the front yard. 6 MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: 7 I'm very familiar with that. 8 MS. KAREN NANCE: Yeah, and then it 9 would run into Turkey Creek, whereas now the soil, 10 you know, as it builds up over the years keeps 11 12 getting more and more saturated around the house when it can't go, which is why it's a perfect 13 14 swamp. It's got that lay out there. I dig in it 15 doing archeology, which makes it wonderful for 16 you-all to have as a swamp because it, you know, 17 doesn't drain. And so the water around the house 18 doesn't drain either. It needs to be able to run 19 further from the house and get into Turkey Creek. 20 MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: Okay. You 21 22 say the trees are dying? 23 MS. KAREN NANCE: Yeah.

MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE:

I was up

```
there this week, and they are not. Not only that,
1
2
     but some of those trees are sycamore trees which
3
     are river bottom trees and they're used to having
     their roots wet, and water is not going to kill
4
     them all.
5
                    MS. KAREN NANCE: Well, Greg picks
6
7
     up limbs.
               He can tell you.
                    MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE:
                                             There's
8
     always limbs down on trees, healthy trees, year
 9
10
     round --
11
                    MS. KAREN NANCE: Do you see the
     big --
12
                    MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: -- but the
13
14
     trees around there, they're all leafed out and
15
     they have no appearance of dying.
          But the only reason you want that then is to
16
17
     preserve the house?
                     MRS. KAREN NANCE: Right.
                                                That's
18
     the only reason I want it moved, and that's why I
19
20
     didn't -- wasn't it --
                                             But if it's
                     MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE:
21
22
     not damaging the house, well, then you're not
     interested in having it drained?
23
                     MRS. KAREN NANCE: Well, see,
24
```

that's where the thing is. I believe it's damaging the house. I would like to see a study, a written study, that -- percolator -- perking tests and everything out there to show that that soil not being overly saturated around the house. MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: But you are saying then that if there's no damage being done to the house, then you're not interested in having

it drained? That's the only reason for it?

MRS. KAREN NANCE: Well, I will say that I know there's damage being done to the house.

MR. BUDRUS: Okay. That's one of the things that we're going to consider and we'll look into and have someone from geotech take another look at that. But we have had geotechnical engineers -- I'm tongue-tied now -- evaluate that.

I thought that the concern was, one, that the wetland was affect the foundation of the house; two was that I thought you wanted more area for historical activities than there is there currently now.

MRS. KAREN NANCE: Well, if we went

down the side. But mostly I really feel like essentially like when there's flooding and, you know, you have a flash flood and water comes in a hurry, it can't get out Turkey Creek as well as it used to be able to. And having that in the very front like the doesn't give any place for the water to build up like a wetland should.

I mean wetlands are supposed to help in flooding because they're not wet 100 percent of the year in the sense that they're not flooded 100 percent of the year.

So, instead of helping when you keep that pool there, there's nowhere for that water to go where it would normally fill that area up and then drain out. But so that does concern me, too.

MR. BUDRUS: Okay. And we have your concerns and we'll look at them. We'll look at those and we'll look at your point of view, too.

MR. PETE SAMOSKY: I'm Peter Samosky.

MR. BUDRUS: Okay.

MR. PETE SAMOSKY: And thank you for your letter to the paper. It terrified me,

and that's why I'm here.

I think the Corps went to a great deal of trouble, and one of the primary reasons was to create a habitat. That's why things got flooded, and that's why there's this existing wetland in front of the house.

If you take 200 feet out of there, the boardwalk that is there now is useless and you've taken the best bird-watching area in the county away from us to accomplish relatively nothing.

My point is if you want to build anything out there, you have to have a very powerful reason to remove habitat they went to a great deal of trouble to put in, to build anything. I just don't believe that can be the spot. That can't be the best spot to build anything. Put the museum on the super block where people can come and see it and --

MS. KAREN NANCE: You can't --

MR. BUDRUS: Okay.

MS. KAREN NANCE: If the historic preservation is moving an historic structure --

MR. PETE SAMOSKY: Well, don't move the structure. Preserve the house. Preserve it

to death. Preserve it and dig it down and clean every block with a toothbrush. But don't take away habitat we went to a great deal of trouble to put in. I just can't believe that's the best place to build anything.

MR. BUDRUS: I'd like to have your concerns, but let's try not to argue.

MR. PETE SAMOSKY: My concern is about keeping the place to -- I know there's a lot of difference between the preservationists and the wildlife people, but, my heavens, there's not enough wetland around, which is why this happened to start with. And to remove anything, one inch of wet land, I just don't -- I've not heard anything to justify that.

MR. BUDRUS: There are -- there are ways around that, though. If you fill in an acre of wetland, you create another acre somewhere else. So, there are ways to mitigate that.

MR. PETE SAMOSKY: Well, I think you also need to take into account that there's a boardwalk there now for observation, you know, and it's on the back side of the house. If you stand in the house and look across that pond, that's

where the boardwalk is. If you drain that, that boardwalk is now useless.

MR. BUDRUS: And that would have to be mitigated, but there are options we can evaluate. And your point is well taken, and we had, you know, several letters come in, voicing the same concerns, the effect that this would have on the wetland and the effect that this would have on the annual use of the wetland.

So, those concerns have to be looked at, too.

MR. BUDRUS: Ned Jones.

MR. NED JONES: First of all, what I've tried to do in my involvement with the Green Bottom Society is to really build on what I think is a very positive situation, and that is to see -- rather than focus on what the differences have been in the past between the various groups, to see what we could do collectively to really make this the best attraction we could possibly make and also at the same time restore the historical heritage that we really have at that site.

I think what Congressman Rahall has done, what Senator Byrd has done in this legislation is really wonderful. And I think when we look at

what they have done and the potential that they have, that this can be a site that Culture and History can be very proud of, that can bring a lot of people. But at the same time, what we have to also do I think is to work with the people, with the wetlands, with everything that exists out there right now and see what -- what collectively working together we can really accomplish.

Let me tell you, I'm in another issue called a regional airport issue where we're finding it very difficult for people to work together, and it's sometimes extremely disappointing.

And I see this as an opportunity because of the funding that is available to us in this county. And I know that Congressman Rahall is interested in the wetland issue; he's interested in what the DNR, what the hunters have to do, and he's also interested in the historical significance of the Jenkins House.

And so what I as one individual am interested in is trying to see how we bring all of this together. And the Green Bottom Society passed a resolution which says that we want to be proactive in this whole approach, that we want to work with

people on this situation, that we want to see what can be developed.

We think that what is put in the legislation which calls for restoration will really change that house out there because that restoration, my understanding is from talking to Congressman Rahall's representative, Jim Zoya (Phonetic), is that that is not just a house but is also the outbuildings that go with the house.

I don't know how many of you-all have ever been to Blennerhassett to see what an attraction Blennerhassett can be. But I would think what a wonderful thing that would be in our county if we could have something of that nature that could draw people to this area.

And so how do we do that and how do we work with the people with the wetlands to be able to make sure that that's another attraction. There shouldn't be one attraction versus another or one winner and one loser. If we get into that situation, I can tell you exactly what's going to happen. Nobody is going to win.

And so what we want to do is that we passed a resolution supporting that we proactively work

together on this whole issue, that we work with Culture and History and everybody else to see what can be done to really develop the potential of that site, to see what can be done, as Karen has talked about, as far as developing a historic museum for the Underground Railroad, for the black experience.

2.1

One of the things that we also talked about is because of the fact of that being a Clover Indian site and all the significance that's there, but there's nothing out there that really if you go out there right now shows you that. I mean think about the history of this county, those many years ago when we had the Clover Indian site, you know, then those villages were there, and it's all gone.

When people talk about studying history, one of the sadest things I think in West Virginia is we start talking about history, it really starts about 1863, you know. And we really need to go back and reflect on all the history of the region and capitalize on it.

And it was a tough issue, I can tell you. A lot of people have worked hard and on both sides

of this issue. And what we agreed to do with the Green Bottom Society resolution was that we wanted to put aside the issue of water and where water is and figure out first what our attraction is going to be. And if someday in the future we decided there might be an additional need because of what was there and we could draw more people there and if we work well with the wetlands, if we work well with the DNR and everything else, if we -- we wanted to reserve the right to go back and revisit that.

But let's see how much money we can draw down. Let's see what an attraction you can make, because if everybody in this room works together, I think a lot of good things can happen. We can bring a lot of people to Huntington, you know, pull people in here who are going to really be interested and really start letting people know how special our area is.

So, that's -- that's what we're trying to do.

That's what we agreed to do as the Green Bottom

Society, and that's what I pledge to go ahead and

work on as hard as I can.

I'm happy to answer questions.

MR. PETE SAMOSKY: 1 I see a couple of problems there. I'm hopeful -- you're a good 2 ways from Huntington in Green Bottom, but I'm just 3 concerned if you build anything there that's going 5 to cause an attraction, if it gets a lot of people, you've got parking lots, you've got 6 7 pavements. The birds that I go out to see are not They're gone. They are not going to be 8 there. there. I mean --9 10 MR. NED JONES: So, you don't think 11 it's mutually compatible? 12 MR. PETE SAMOSKY: It doesn't appear to be. The way the place is laid out now, 13 I don't say how that is. 14 15 MR. NED JONES: How many acres are 16 there? 17 MR. PETE SAMOSKY: See, I think that's a bit of a red herring. There's not enough 18 acres there. But most of those are not wet. 19 And 20 again, it's the shore birds that I'm talking about 21 that go to the shore. And where else -- there is 22 not another place -- there are certain birds that

you're only going to see in that pound in front of

23

24

that house.

And it may seem like a really trivial thing to some of you-all, but where else in this county are you going to be able to see those? I don't know of any place.

MR. NED JONES: So, it's your opinion that the house shouldn't be restored?

MR. PETE SAMOSKY: No, I'm all for restoring the house. I'm just concerned about this idea of an attraction, of a tourist center.

I think it's incompatible with the wetlands, and I really think you must really -- I'm concerned about that.

MR. NED JONES: I think if you see the house -- first of all, the legislation calls for the restoration. As I understand it, the restoration is not just for the house but for the principal outbuildings that were part of what was there originally, the kitchen, the office, the barn, whatever you had in that environment.

It is not -- I think if you want to be historically correct, I don't think you want to put buildings there that are going to all of a sudden stick out there. This isn't a -- but maybe we have -- say, for instance, one of the things

we've offered to do is we have a barn where I grew 1 2 up in Point Pleasant that was probably built in the 1830s we would like to give to the group if 3 they just want to move it down because it's a 4 period piece. And maybe within that barn and that 5 setting, you have the opportunity to have an 7 underground railroad museum, to have a museum on the Clover Indians and what they did for the area. 8 MR. PETE SAMOSKY: What about 9 10 parking? MR. NED JONES: Well, maybe what 11 you do -- and the question is and what's the --12 MR. BUDRUS: We'll be able to look 13 14 at that. MR. NED JONES: -- is how you do 15 I know one of the suggestions has been is 16 that. whether you could put parking and paving on the 17 other side of Route 2 and have an underpass there 18 under the road or some other way of being able to 19 20 access that, because obviously there isn't enough if you want to bring -- if you want to bring the 21

But I think when you have a historic landmark of this significance, you don't want to say you

22

23

24

cars in.

have it but you're not going to allow people to frequent it.

3

MR. PETE SAMOSKY: No, I agree.

But realistically how are you going to fund it?

Since 1996, the Division of Culture and History is staffing it. I've been out there a hundred times and have never been able to get in.

MR. NED JONES: Well, I think what it has to become is a significant historic site, and I don't think right it is -- as you look at the architecture of that house, the significance is what it once was. The roof is not the type of roof. The outbuildings are not there now.

So go ahead and you get the full feel of what that environment was like at that time. And one of the great things is I think that because of having Senator Byrd and Congressman Rahall that I believe that with what they mandated that the Corps do, that between the three of them that there's going to be adequate funding to make this all happen because that's what the law requires.

So, if you can -- the question is if you can make it happen, let's make it happen the right way so that we can all work together and -- and think

about the attraction. I think some people want to go up and see the historic site. Then we would say here is another experience. Think about the bird-watching and the floral and aquatics and everything that's out there, go over to the museum that might be in a barn with the underground railroad black experience and get a flavor and feel for all that they went through, the Clover Indians and that whole period of time.

I think it would be a wonderful experience and it would go -- but to have that happen, we've all got to try to see how we can make it work together. I know it's tough for some people about the water and everything else, but what we agreed to do as a group is let's put aside our differences and work on what we have in common to see if we really can't make this a winning situation.

MR. BUDRUS: What we'd like to do is try to work together to see if we can come up with something that's good for both sides. It may not be perfect, but hopefully we can satisfy the interests on both sides. And that's what we want to try. We want to work together to get to that

point. And I think there's some possibilities 1 2 here. 3 Go ahead. MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: 4 I want to 5 know approximately how many visitors you-all have 6 there a year now? 7 MR. NED JONES: You know, I'm not 8 sure, because one of the --MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: 9 Somebody 10 should know. There should be a log, a sign-in 11 log. 12 MR. NED JONES: Okay. But if you would, let me finish. 13 What I'm talking about is not what is there 14 15 but what we have a potential to have there. Blennerhassett at one time was nothing but a 16 17 foundation and is now a significant attraction. 18 One of the reasons a lot of people who were 19 concerned from the Green Bottom Society was that 20 you can go in right now into the floor joists, you know, of the first floor and stick a butter knife 21 up into those floor joists several inches. 22 I mean there are a lot of significant 23

problems, structural problems, going on there.

They're allowing this house to rapidly, in my opinion, just deteriorate. And so the first concern was to stop that.

The second one is, and what this legislation calls for, is restoration. Restoration is a lot different than what we have there right now. What we have right now is just a house that's slowly I just think sort of rotting away.

MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: Well, do you have any estimate on how many people you're going to get?

MR. NED JONES: No, sir. My -once again, my thought is not what is there but
what we have a potential for. And let me give you
an analogy.

You know, we're fighting -- and I'm going to give you this issue again because I've worked so hard on it. We're fighting an airport issue, and the people from -- some of the people from Charleston are saying, well, you don't have enough passengers to support a new regional airport.

My response to that was if we build the airport and certain companies come in, they're going to create the additional usage that we need.

1 In same tone, I think that if you take this 2 site and you develop -- I mean you don't have the 3 outbuildings there. You have the central structure, which is the house, but not the kitchen and not the office and various outbuildings that 5 6 go with that that really make up that whole image of what it was back in the 1850s and 1860s. That's the attraction I think that will bring 8 people to this area. 9 10 MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: 11 that's a -- that's a nice speech and everything 12 like that. But we have to still have some idea of 13 how many people are coming there a year to know whether there would be that much interest in it. 14 15 MR. BUDRUS: We haven't got to that 16 point yet, I think. 17 MS. NANCY HERHOLDT: We have 18 figures. We are open to the public and promote 19 that we are available three days a week ten to 20 four, I believe. 21 MR. PETE SAMOSKY: That's not 22 accurate. That's not true. 23 A VOICE: No, it's not true. 24 MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: You may

1 promote it, but it's not true. But go ahead. How 2 many people? MS. NANCY HERHOLDT: 3 Those are -those are when we are available to the public, 4 from ten to four three days a week. In one year 5 6 and 12 months, we see about 400 people at this time trying just to come in and tour the house. 7 The future is a lot --8 MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: 400 people? 9 10 MS. NANCY HERHOLDT: But right now, we're realizing about 400 people. 11 MR. PETE SAMOSKY: Well, I'd ask 12 that you keep in mind that those ponds out there 13 -- you've got the north pond; you've got another 14 15 pond -- are the only place for shore -- if you can walk right there on that boardwalk, that is the 16 17 only place you have protected shore you can get to. If you've got to --18 MR. BUDRUS: What I was saying is 19 we can create that somewhere else. 20 21

MR. PETE SAMOSKY: I'm going to say keep that in mind, but that a real thing to a lot of people, and there's way more than 400 people go out there and look at the fish, the pond and look

22

23

1	at the birds.
2	MS. BEVERLY WHITE: The wetlands
3	there were some wetlands there originally? I mean
4	just not like a small strip, as I recall from the
5	slide?
6	MR. BUDRUS: Yes, the existing
7	wetlands were there for quite some time.
8	MR. PETE SAMOSKY: Before the
9	Corps.
10	MS. BEVERLY WHITE: But what you're
11	talking about was existing wetlands before? It
12	was not made by the Corps?
13	MS. KAREN NANCE: It was made by
14	the Corps in front of the house.
15	MR. WENDELL ARGABRITE: No.
16	MS. CLARA KNIGHT: My name is Clara
17	Knight.
18	MR. BUDRUS: Could we have it one
19	at a time so that he can record that, though?
20	MS. CLARA KNIGHT: And the pool
21	that we are talking about is not an original
22	wetland. It didn't appear there until the Corps
23	made it. It was dry.
24	MR. PETE SAMOSKY: Then the slide

1 is incorrect.

MS. CLARA KNIGHT: What I was trying to get to, '92, that was after the Corps came.

MR. BUDRUS: What we have here is this is the existing Green Bottom wetlands -- not to scale on this drawing, though. I'll admit that. But that is the existing Green Bottom wetlands that has been there historically. Between I'd say the late eighties, early nineties and today, due to the beaver dam activity, the level of that wetland has gone up about a foot to foot and a half. That is true, and that has happened naturally based on the beaver dam activity.

But that wetland was there and has been there for years. It's just that the level is a little bit higher now than it was in the late eighties.

MS. KAREN NANCE: But was it a pool of water or just merely wetlands? Because I know that wetlands are not -- this is Karen Nance -- is necessarily wet as far as standing water goes a hundred percent of the year, because I have a Master's in geography. So, the wetlands that

you're talking about did not have standing water 1 in them most of the time. But there was -- up 2 from the house, there was an area that had some 3 shallow water in it --4 5 MR. BUDRUS: Right here. MS. KAREN NANCE: -- for some time, 6 because I was out there at Clover in the 1980s 7 8 when we dug at the archeology site, and I was there many times and the front lawn was dry. 10 Clara has photographs of the front lawn being dry 11 when they lived there. You couldn't see the 12 water. But there was some wetlands up river from the 13 house that stayed like, you know, fairly wet, with 14 some standing waters in it, more like a little 15 16 creek. 17 MR. BUDRUS: And that's reflected 18 by the change in the water elevation over the last 19 ten years, yes. I do agree there. 20 MS. SUSAN PIERCE: I have a question, Wayne. 21 MR. BUDRUS: Go ahead. 22 MS. SUSAN PIERCE: My name is Susan 23 24 Pierce. And then -- with respect to the wetland,

when you showed the historic photograph that was 1 dated 1906, was the wet area in front of the house 2 3 in that picture? MR. BUDRUS: We can go back and 4 look at the picture, but it's almost impossible to 5 tell based on that photograph. It's an old --6 7 MS. SUSAN PIERCE: My point would 8 be the association of the wet area, not using the term "wetland" specifically, but the historic 9 character of that land feature during the time of 10 occupation of the house by the General. 11 12 MR. BUDRUS: At one time, that area was drained. There was drain tile put in. 13 area was drained. It was used as farms or 14 15 orchards. 16 MR. MASLOWSKI: Okay. The wetlands were drained in 1870 and -- between 1870 and 17 between 1880, according to the historic records. 18 Basically all that you see in wetlands today was 19 probably wetland soils and wetlands 20 prehistorically, and --21 MS. SUSAN PIERCE: But at the time 22 23 when the General was there, Bob? I mean you can only go back as far as 1870s, 1880s in the

historic records? 1 MR. MASLOWSKI: That's when the 2 entire Green Bottom area, according to the 3 newspaper accounts, was drained and the wetlands 4 were turned into prime cropland. 5 MR. BUDRUS: I couldn't tell you 6 7 the exact extent of that wetland during the 1800s 8 based on what we know now. MS. SUSAN PIERCE: And I guess it 9 would be hard to understand the natural -- you'd 10 have to look at all that to determine what's the 11 12 natural water table, water area or water content of the land as opposed to what man has done to it? 13 MR. BUDRUS: Uh-huh. 14 MS. SUSAN PIERCE: I mean you could 15 trace that and the change over each decade. 16 MR. PETE SAMOSKY: Did it not say 17 it was prehistorically wetlands? Did I not hear 18 that? 19 MR. MASLOWSKI: Yes. All the soils 20 there are wetland soils. And if you look at the 21 22 distribution of the archeological sites, the sites

are all on the high ground. The stuff where you

don't have sites is wetland space.

23